



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/053,179

01/15/2002

Kenneth L. Stanwood

112174-010UTL

2846

30868

7590

07/29/2008

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 DUKE STREET
SUITE 240
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SEFCHECK, GREGORY B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2619

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/053,179	Applicant(s) STANWOOD ET AL.	
	Examiner GREGORY B. SEFCHECK	Art Unit 2619	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) GREGORY B. SEFCHECK, Examiner of Record. (3) Curt Dodd and Mike McCartney, Applicants.
 (2) Terry Kramer, Applicant's Representative. (4) Scott Pojunas, Applicant's Representative.

Date of Interview: 24 July 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 51-75, as proposed to be amended..

Identification of prior art discussed: Sengodan (US6918034) and Koodli (US6608841).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion of the differences between the present & proposed claims with the prior art of record was had. Clarifying amendments were discussed that would overcome the art of record. Applicant's indicated intent to file a submission proposing such amendments in due course..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Gregory B Sefcheck/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2619

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required